

Alameda County Workshop
May 14, 2008, 6pm-8pm
Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter Auditorium
Oakland, CA

Some 60 people were in attendance. Commissioner Dorene Giacomini offered introductory remarks. Participants watched a 12-minute video, and then had the opportunity to answer a series of questions via electronic voting. A discussion followed each question, where participants were able to bring up other issues, questions and concerns.

The Three E's

How would you rank these three goals?

	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Economy	48	31.58%
Environment	53	34.87%
Equity	51	33.55%
Totals	152	100%

Maintenance

Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Option A: making investments to maintain the existing system of roads, and the existing bus, rail and ferry services in the region	37	68.52%
Option B: making investments to build new roads and add more bus, rail and ferry services in the region	17	31.48%
Totals	54	100%

Comments:

- Option A is good because Option B means building more roads; even if you expand rail, only a small portion would go towards rail
- Option A, because the street I live has reverted to a dirt road; we can't keep up with what we currently have
- I like to protest these options; I don't see the option to expand transit and maintain transit without building new roads
- BART should surround the Bay; we don't have enough jobs accessible on the mainline of BART and other rail lines
- I don't like the options; I would like to expand for only rail and bus service; over committed to cars
- Option B because I want to see investments in new transit technologies; I'd rather see shift out of automobiles regardless of pavement condition
- I want to protest this question; I voted for Option B; if we choke off the funds to expanded roads, we'd have enough money for both road maintenance and transit maintenance/expansion

How much of our \$30M should be spent on maintenance?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Up to 25% (\$7.5 billion)	18	46.15%
Up to 50% (\$15 billion)	9	23.08%
Up to 75% (\$22.5 billion)	10	25.64%
100% (\$30 billion)	2	5.13%
Totals	39	100%

Congestion Relief

Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Option A: Investing in <u>highway</u> system to relieve traffic congestion. (For example, ramp metering, high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes.)	3	5.77%
Option B: Investing in <u>public transit</u> options including rail and buses to provide alternatives to driving.	40	76.92%
Option C: Investing in <u>walking paths and bicycle lanes</u> to provide alternatives to driving.	9	17.31%
Totals	52	100%

Comments:

- Option B because we've spent 70-80% of funding in the last 80 years, we need to spend more on the rail system; there is no rail around the Bay
- In Alameda and Contra Costa counties, the freeways should be widened so that there would be BART in the median; would be relatively cheap, no need for major earthwork and structures; BART should go between Millbrae and the Santa Clara Station
- Option B because transit infrastructure is more expensive than walk/bike infrastructure
- Option C because access and safety is incredibly inadequate for walking and bicycling
- Option C; there's bus service but no sidewalks or bike lanes in San Rafael; no place for bus to stop and pick up/drop off riders
- We should put Option B and C together; I voted for C as a protest
- BART goes to some places I would like to go; but just walking a few blocks at night forces me to drive instead; safety is important for women
- The consensus is that the interstate freeway system should be used for intercity traveling; if you are in town and commuting, there should be more alternatives to the car, such as transit, walking, and biking
- the high gas prices will affect how people get around using cars; there needs to be alternatives
- I don't see an option for removing these freeways; need to start studying this option; I-80 should be removed – destroys access to harbor area

What do you think is the best way to share the road with trucks?

	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Keep trucks out of the peak commuter hours	8	20%
Allow smaller trucks to use carpool lanes during congested periods for a fee	2	5%
Encourage more cargo deliveries be made by rail or ferries	20	50%
Build exclusive truck lanes supported by trucking fees	4	10%
Provide more truck parking in commercial business areas	6	15%
Totals	40	100%

Focused Growth

Which of these should be a higher investment priority?

	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
<u>Option A:</u> Providing more transportation funds to communities that are planning to build more housing along BART and other public transit lines	42	85.71%
<u>Option B:</u> Providing transportation funds evenly to communities regardless of where they are planning to build homes	7	14.29%
Totals	49	100%

Comments:

- Option A because it's a no-brainer; need to give incentives for people to do the right thing
- Option A because the goal is to get more people walking, biking, and taking transit, it makes sense that housing should go near the transit lines; encourage cities to support this type of development is good use of MTC money
- Option A, but you should have a question on jobs proximity to transit
- People who are further from transport facilities need more money to get access to these transport facilities
- This sets up punishing communities that may not have access to transportation; need to consider equity
- Need high-speed transit; we should be discussing what NEEDS to be done first rather than the pet projects of the various jurisdictions
- It's expensive to provide transit service in low-density areas; the most important thing is to start the incentives right now to encourage the right type of development
- Need to incentivize increasing density in suburban communities

Access

Transit Subsidy Based on Income: Transit fare discounts are currently given to youth, seniors, and the disabled. In addition to these subsidies, do you think there should be a subsidy for low-income transit riders?

There should be a subsidy for low income riders.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	18	35.29%
Agree	16	31.37%
Neutral	3	5.88%
Disagree	7	13.73%
Strongly Disagree	7	13.73%
Totals	51	100%

Comments:

- public transit should be free; eliminate need for ticket people; in Seattle the downtown is free
- we think the transit-dependents already have fewer resources, therefore it's about time that they get this kind of subsidy
- my presumption is that the youth and seniors/disabled were given subsidies for economic concerns and that this income-based subsidy is just a natural extension
- we should air quality money and subsidize low-income people who drive old cars, which are the big emitters
- I voted to disagree if the aim is to get people to ride transit for the sake of riding transit (joyriding)
- in a dense area with frequent boarding/alighting, the collection of fares diminishes transit service; should eliminate
- free transit would eliminate the need to find quarters and dimes for the farebox; affords people to get out and about and travel to new places at different times more conveniently

I favor basing all transit fare subsidies on income rather than age or disability.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	11	22.45%
Agree	11	22.45%
Neutral	8	16.33%
Disagree	6	12.24%
Strongly Disagree	13	26.53%
Totals	49	100%

Comments:

- Whenever you means-test anything, a lot of people will not go through such a process; for the people who are really low income and have their pride; would wind up leaving many

people out; if you make it free for all under 25 years and over 65 years, more people would take advantage of transit

- It's difficult to discuss this issue; we're not discussing the subsidies we give to driving; getting more to ride transit is a good thing for the environment

Emissions Reduction

Which of these should be a higher investment priority?

	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Option A: Focusing on reducing tailpipe emissions and encouraging alternatives to driving.	44	89.80%
Option B: Improving our ability to drive more easily around the Bay Area.	5	10.20%
Totals	49	100%

Comments:

- We need to BART around the Bay so that it's an integrated system, including to Antioch and Livermore
- Rail system around the Bay; there should be an integrated network of rail lines; doesn't all have to be one house brand; closing the Millbrae to San Jose gap is expensive; we have enough BART
- Half of GHG emissions from automobiles; facing serious consequences when considering whether to build more highways
- We need to force mass transit socialization and indoctrination with Option A; if transit was forced, we'd get out of our problems
- Option A because the kind of investments have other benefits aside from getting people around; make our communities healthier; connect communities; Option B would only have one benefit -- making people drive more
- The value of reducing emissions, the benefit is not there anymore (vs. in the 1970's)
- Rebuttal to separated rail system: we do need BART-based system; relatively inexpensive especially in the middle of freeways

Which programs do you think are most effective to reduce the amount of CO2 emissions?

	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Subsidize purchase of newer/cleaner vehicles	2	6.06%
Provide more/cheaper public transit	16	48.48%
Develop regional awareness campaign to encourage people to reduce fossil fuel use	2	6.06%
Build more bike paths and sidewalks	2	6.06%
Funding incentives to cities to allow more development near transit	6	18.18%
Support local traffic signal timing coordination	5	15.15%
Totals	33	100%

Comments: Most effective way to reduce CO2:

- we are starting to look at electric cars; necessary
- Ecuador's public transit system is better; just buses and polluting; carrying 30 passengers constantly; every 2 minutes; it doesn't take a revolution in technology; it's not too hard
- 24-hour, everywhere transit; if you want to enjoy open space, you need a car to access
- No convenient way to access Cesar Chavez Park from Berkeley BART; should be a priority to funding these operations; perhaps it's time to rethink allocation of funds to the various transit operators especially more funding to AC Transit v. BART/Caltrain
- I did not vote because there is a policy that is so much more effective; I need to think of a carbon swap (put in carbon tax and reduce sales tax)
- Gas tax

Investment Tradeoffs

You have \$10 – Click each number once for each dollar you want to spend.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Maintenance	104	20.39%
Congestion Relief	78	15.29%
Focus Growth	94	18.43%
Access	109	21.37%
Emissions Reduction	125	24.51%
Totals	510	100%

New Revenues

Which of the following new revenue sources would you support? (Multiple answers OK)	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Regional gas fee	38	23.46%
Higher bridge toll	22	13.58%
Road tolls	23	14.20%
Vehicle registration fees	36	22.22%
County transportation sales taxes	18	11.11%
Other new revenues	22	13.58%
No new fees or increases	3	1.85%
Totals	162	100%

Open Comments:

County	Comment
Alameda	Free shuttles to/from BART
Alameda	Global climate change is an emergency, then we need to reassess the committed funding

Alameda	We should ask instead what the priority needs are; in the 1950's the priority was the interstate system; \$30 billion is not going to address the major transportation problems; need to reassess past commitments such as BART to San Jose; we have 20 years to get the solutions right, otherwise no more opportunities; we can't spend \$192 billion wrong and expect spending \$30 billion will make things better
Alameda	My concern is that there is a lot of politics such as BART to San Jose and the Chinatown subway; these projects don't pencil out for most people; need to keep this in mind throughout this process; need to reassess how we finance this nation's infrastructure
Alameda	There should be full funding of the regional bicycle network; there would be ready access to a majority of homes in the region
Alameda	What is MTC's role in support or not supporting high-speed train
Alameda	In the last 18months, MTC has shown good awareness of climate change, etc.; but R3434 has a lot of anachronistic or very cost-ineffective; will MTC be willing to reassess those R3434 projects to see if those projects still make sense
Alameda	Need integration and seamlessness of all public transit services
Alameda	MTC needs to support ideas; a huge chunk of the \$30 billion should be for entrepreneurs; should have an idea submittal form on MTC's website
Alameda	We should definitely avoid waste; I can think of freeway overpasses that are expensive; BART to SFO was put underground; would be less \$0.5billion of BART was above grade; ACCMA is planning an HOV lane on 580 – should be deferred; at Union City, there is a proposed intermodal system but wrong location, should be at Oakland Coliseum Station instead
Alameda	We are facing a serious problem with climate change; need to question the legal basis of Measure B of having 50% of funding going to highways
Alameda	Need to discourage use of cars; there's a war, global warming, congestion; it would make more sense to come up with a plan that's revenue neutral and the overall direction is to discourage driving
Alameda	Need to make transit as convenient as possible to encourage mode shift; need a smart card
Alameda	We need to put money in completing the bike, rail, lifeline, HOV networks
Alameda	I want to see all-nighter bus services around SFO and Millbrae
Alameda	I concur with revenue-neutral programs; public transit should be shrouded as what low-income people uses
Alameda	I can't believe that you continue to put bike/ped against transit; please put them together; they are not competing against each other; no transit or bike facilities through Caldecott to access the open spaces/parks; free bikes should be considered; zoning of cities prevent us from doing Smart Growth
Alameda	Need to make connections to remote areas that are currently not served well by transit; national parks in Marin; shuttle services would reduce emissions from folks driving to these remote areas
Alameda	Safety in getting to transit is important; it's not safe to wait at the bus stop at night; it's not safe for low-income people to access public transit at night
Alameda	My concern is the emphasis on fund allocation; I don't think we can solve our transport problems by constraining ourselves to the \$30 billion; we need to broaden to discuss pricing and land use; it bothers me with subsidies; there are some equity problems with who's paying for these subsidies and who is receiving them
Alameda	We lost public restrooms post-9/11 in BART stations; there should be some

	accommodation for transit customers
Alameda	We've lost a lot of corporations because they couldn't get the employees to live and commute affordably and conveniently in the region; we need to incent corporations to help their employees get to work to magnify the impact of the \$30 billion

Written Comments Submitted at Workshop:

Category	County	Comment
Meeting format	Alameda	Questions set up a series of false alternatives. Survey method is limiting and prevents audience from collaborating to make positive observations.
Public transit	Alameda	Public transportation needs to be the key, urgent priority. Make it fast and frequent, cheap and convenient.
Freeway/ road expansion: Opposed	Alameda	No freeway/road expansion. No more Caldecott tunnel expansion.
Public transit	Alameda	Connectivity to various non-auto options "yes, yes, yes
Car share programs	Alameda	Support various car share programs and facilities
Public transit	Alameda	Increase transit service to regional and other parks
Meeting format	Alameda	Thanks for this opportunity; please have workshops at schools and senior centers
High-Speed Rail	Alameda	MTC should reach out to the public on high-speed rail projects that will benefit the state on a more global level.
Public transit	Alameda	Please address the missing practical transit links from West Contra Costa to Marin County (particularly Southern Marin).
Public Transit	Alameda	Improve access to park lands and open space
Public Transit	Alameda	Consider needs of people living outside the Bay Area
Public transit	Alameda	"Right size" transit modes—consider more smaller versatile buses, shuttles, etc.
Public Involvement	Alameda	Reach out to under-served and low-income groups Weeds Contra Costa seems under-represented in these workshops.
Public Transit: Rail/ Focused Growth	Alameda	How about getting as many office jobs as possible located near transit hubs or new hubs located next to jobs? Getting to work requires a car because there are few effective rail services near employment centers; buses just don't work for many.
Public Transit	Alameda	How about a family pass or free transit on weekends for getting out and around?
Public Transit: Coordination	Alameda	Coordination of different agencies is crucial. Also coordination of biking/walking with public transit. Replace piecemeal planning with region-wide planning (easier said than done).
Public Transit: Security	Alameda	Agrees with comments about safety as part of the equity/access issue.
Focused Growth: Car sharing	Alameda	Car sharing might be an important part of transportation solutions in the future. New mixed-use development could have their own car share programs.
Bicycle/pedestrian: linked to	Alameda	Bicycle and pedestrian improvements are closely linked to transit

public transit		
Bicycle/pedestrian	Alameda	Look at some of the free bicycle programs in place around the world: Paris, Lyon, DC,
Public Transit: Access	Alameda	Little or no access to parks and nature areas via public transit
Freeway/Road Expansion: Opposed	Alameda	Stop the 4 th Bore on the Caldecott Tunnel; use the funding for bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure, or on public education programs to encourage use of alternatives to driving.
Focused Growth	Alameda	Reduce parking requirements in zoning codes for both residential and commercial/industrial to encourage more compact communities, shorter trips. This is a no-cost option with built-in incentives to use buses, bicycles or walk.
Public Transit	Alameda (San Mateo resident)	Supports more All-Nighter service in Northern San Mateo County (for example, between the Daly City and Millbrae BART stations).
Public Transit: Bicycle Access	Alameda (San Mateo resident)	Supports a permit system on BART for bicycles, allowing bicycle access to the system during peak commute times
Meeting Format: Video	Alameda County	Should have included BCDC executive Will Travis, along with credits for the child actors; video focused on fund allocation, a small part of the systemic solution needed.
Focused Growth	Alameda County	Focused growth needs job surpluses, an emphasis on walking and bicycling.
Public Transit: High Speed Rail	Alameda County	High-speed rail analysis was biased by reduced Altamont service assumptions in estimating ridership.
Transportation Pricing	Alameda County	Pricing solves virtually all transportation problems and needs more attention ... the great findings about the role of pricing and focused growth from the fall regional forum seem lost now. Be careful of the equity impacts of subsidies.

Demographic Questions asked at Workshop:

1.) How did you get here this evening?	Responses	
Drove	14	26.92%
BART/Muni/Bus	26	50%
Carpool	2	3.85%
Bike	4	7.69%
Walked	6	11.54%
Totals	52	100%

2.) How would you describe yourself?	Responses	
Business Advocate	4	3.20%
Environmental Advocate	25	20%
Community Advocate	21	16.80%
Government/Agency Staff	22	17.60%
Concerned Individual	38	30.40%
Social Justice Advocate	15	12%
Elected Official	0	0%
Totals	125	100%

3.) How did you hear about tonight's meeting?	Responses	
Flyer	21	36.84%
Website	5	8.77%
Email	22	38.60%
Other	9	15.79%
Totals	57	100%

4.) Do you use public transportation regularly? (one to two times a week)	Responses	
Yes	42	72.41%
No	16	27.59%
Totals	58	100%

5.) Have you attended a public meeting or workshop on Bay Area transportation in the past?	Responses	
Yes	41	69.49%
No	18	30.51%
Totals	59	100%

6.) What County do you live in?	Responses	
Alameda	47	79.66%
Contra Costa	5	8.47%
Marin	1	1.69%
Napa	0	0%
San Francisco	5	8.47%
San Mateo	1	1.69%
Santa Clara	0	0%
Solano	0	0%
Sonoma	0	0%
Totals	59	100%

7.) What is your gender?	Responses	
Male	35	60.34%
Female	23	39.66%
Totals	58	100%

8.) Are you Hispanic/Latino?	Responses	
Yes	4	7.41%
No	50	92.59%
Totals	54	100%

9.) How do you identify yourself (click all that apply)	Responses	
White	42	71.19%
Chinese	2	3.39%
Vietnamese	0	0%
Asian/Indian	0	0%
Black/African American	3	5.08%
Japanese	2	3.39%
Filipino	2	3.39%
American Indian/Alaskan	4	6.78%
Other Asian	0	0%
Other Race	4	6.78%
Totals	59	100%

10.) What is your age?	Responses	
24 years and under	3	5%
Between 25 and 59	44	73.33%
Over 60	13	21.67%
Totals	60	100%

Meeting Evaluation Questions Asked at Workshops:

31.) I had the opportunity to provide comments.	Responses	
Strongly Agree	11	35.48%
Agree	11	35.48%
Neutral	6	19.35%
Disagree	2	6.45%
Strongly Disagree	1	3.23%
Totals	31	100%

32.) I found the meeting useful and informative.	Responses	
Strongly Agree	2	6.06%
Agree	18	54.55%
Neutral	8	24.24%
Disagree	4	12.12%
Strongly Disagree	1	3.03%
Totals	33	100%

33.) I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives.	Responses	
Strongly Agree	6	18.18%
Agree	20	60.61%
Neutral	6	18.18%
Disagree	1	3.03%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Totals	33	100%

34.) The information presented was clear and had an appropriate level of detail.	Responses	
Strongly Agree	1	3.45%
Agree	5	17.24%
Neutral	8	27.59%
Disagree	8	27.59%
Strongly Disagree	7	24.14%
Totals	29	100%

35.) A quality discussion of key issues took place.	Responses	
Strongly Agree	2	6.25%
Agree	15	46.88%
Neutral	8	25%
Disagree	3	9.38%
Strongly Disagree	4	12.50%
Totals	32	100%

36.) I learned more about transportation planning in the Bay Area by participating tonight.		Responses	
Strongly Agree	3	10%	
Agree	11	36.67%	
Neutral	9	30%	
Disagree	6	20%	
Strongly Disagree	1	3.33%	
Totals	30	100%	

37.) There were no barriers (language or other) that prevented me from participating.		Responses	
Strongly Agree	14	46.67%	
Agree	12	40%	
Neutral	1	3.33%	
Disagree	2	6.67%	
Strongly Disagree	1	3.33%	
Totals	30	100%	